

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8 and 13-22 are now pending, of which Claim 1 is independent. Claims 7, 9-12 and 23-28 are canceled with entry of the present amendment. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability of Claims 12, 14-15 and 17 if rewritten in independent form. To expedite allowance of the application, independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of allowed Claim 12, including all intervening claims. Thus, amended Claim 1 and its respective dependent claims (Claims 2-6, 8 and, 13-22) are now in condition for allowance. Acceptance and allowance is respectfully requested.

The Specification has been objected-to for grammatical errors at page 4. In response to the objection, the Specification has been amended. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 24-25 and 27-28 have been objected-to for informalities. Claims 24-25 and 27-28 are now canceled so the objection to these claims is moot. In response to the objection of Claim 1, Claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-24 and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are canceled. Thus, the rejection is moot. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is traversed. Claims 7, 11-12, 23-24 are canceled, and thus, the rejection to these claims is moot. The rejection to Claim 1 has been addressed by amending Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowed dependent Claim 12. Dependent Claims 2-6, 8, 13-22 include the limitations of base Claim 1 and, are therefore allowable for the same reasons as base Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, and 20-24 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1, 9, 11, and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 7,296,257. Claims 23-24 are canceled, and thus, the rejection to these claims is moot. The rejection to Claim 1 has been addressed by amending Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowed dependent Claim 12. Dependent Claims 2, 3, and 20-22 include the limitations of base Claim 1 and, are therefore allowable for the same reasons as base Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 13, 16, and 18-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,021,273 to Griesemer. Claims 7, 23-24 are canceled, and thus, the rejection to these claims is moot. The rejection to Claim 1 has been addressed by amending Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowed dependent Claim 12. Dependent Claims 2-6, 8, 16, and 18-22 include the limitations of base Claim 1 and, are therefore allowable for the same reasons as base Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 20-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent No. 7,296,257 to Dibble. Claims 23-24 are canceled, and thus, the rejection to these claims is moot. The rejection to Claim 1 has been addressed by amending Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowed dependent Claim 12. Dependent Claims 2-5, 20-22 include the limitations of base Claim 1 and, are therefore allowable for the same reasons as base Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,021,273 to Griesemer. These rejections are traversed. Claims 9-11 are canceled by the present amendment, and thus the rejection is moot. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (SIDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the SIDS is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By /Giovanna H. Fessenden, Reg. No. 60264/  
Giovanna H. Fessenden  
Registration No. 60,264  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133  
Date: August 14, 2008